92-1797

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 1 1993
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

In The

Supreme Court Of The United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1993

JAMES H. NADEAU,
Petitioner,

v.

C. MICHAEL BUDLONG and
THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JAMES H. NADEAU
Petitioner
271 Zion Street
Hartford, CT 06106
(203) 951-8966

QUESTION PRESENTED

May the State of Connecticut, in a civil action wherein a pro se defendant is found by the trial court to be incapable of reasonably hearing the trial proceedings due to a hearing handicap, deny his request for permission to employ a "hearing" assistant during trial?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
OFFICIAL OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT	2
CITATION OF APPLICABLE PROVISIONS	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION	6
CONCLUSION	12
APPENDIX	iA

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Article IV, Section 2, of the United States Constitution..... 3, 9A

Ninth Amendment to the United States Constitution..... 3, 10A

Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution..... 3, 11A

No._____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1993

JAMES H. NADEAU,
Petitioner,

v.

C. MICHAEL BUDLONG
and THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

OFFICIAL OPINIONS BELOW

The official opinion of the Appellate Court of the State of Connecticut in the case of C. Michael Budlong v. James H. Nadeau is reported at 30 Conn. App. 61.

The official decree of the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut denying certification is reported at 225 Conn. 909.

Both decisions are reprinted in the Appendix attached hereto.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

1. The petitioner seeks review of the denial of certification from the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut dated February 24, 1993.

2. Petitioner submits that 28 U.S.C. 1257 (3) confer jurisdiction on this Court to review the decree of the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut denying certification to the petitioner.

CITATION OF APPLICABLE PROVISIONS

1. Art. IV, Section 2, of the United States Constitution.

2. The Ninth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

3. Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The above provisions are reprinted in the Appendix.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner was sued in Connecticut superior court for libel. Respondent, C. Michael Budlong, his former lawyer, received a ten thousand dollar jury verdict. At outset of trial the court found the pro se petitioner to be hard-of-hearing and required a hearing assis-

tant. The judge allowed petitioner to have a friend at his table to assist him as to what was said at trial. Mid-way through trial the court told petitioner to put his examination of a witness in the form of questions and not statements. The court overheard the hearing assistant say "put that in question form" and ejected her from petitioner's table stating that she was giving petitioner legal advice and she was not an attorney. Petitioner requested her return or permission to have another friend provide "hearing" assistance, and the court denied his requests stating that the privilege had been abused because the original assistant was giving legal advice when she stated "put that in question form." For the second half of the trial petitioner pro se had no one at his table to assist him in "hearing." From

time to time he complained to the court that he could not hear the proceedings.

Petitioner appealed to the Connecticut Appellate Court claiming that his right to due process under the United States Constitution had been deprived by the trial court because after the court found that he could not hear the proceedings it denied his request to be permitted someone to assist him in "hearing." Petitioner claimed, and the Appellate Court of Connecticut did not dispute his claim, that the trial court never reversed its original finding that he was hard-of-hearing and required a "hearing" assistant. The Appellate Court decision affirming the trial court's ruling stated that: "...the trial court acted in such a way as to prevent the unlicensed practice of law from occurring in its courtroom

under the guise of hearing assistance. This action was properly within the trial court's discretion." Budlong v Nadeau, 30 Conn. App. 61,67; cert. den.225 Conn. 909.

The petitioner petitioned the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut for certification which was denied on February 24, 1993.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This case presents a question of special and fundamental importance to the just and fair resolution of civil actions in state and federal courts involving millions of physically handicapped defendants who are incapable of securing legal counsel to defend them at trial. This vast and growing citizenry deserves and requires the resolution of an important question of constitutional law which has not been,

but should be, settled by this Court.

In this case, the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut has affirmed a fundamental decision by its lower courts that strikes at the very heart of millions of physically handicapped defendants' constitutional right to defend themselves, without counsel, against civil actions brought against them. The practical effect of the State of Connecticut's decision in this case has consequences for millions of other physically handicapped defendants, in all states, who cannot secure legal counsel in civil actions brought against them, and who are determined by the trial court to be physically incapable of reasonably hearing or seeing what is taking place in the courtroom at trial.

As a consequence of the State of Connec-

ticut's published Appellate Court decision and its Supreme Court's denial of certification in this case, the case-law of Connecticut stands for the proposition, and would be argued by it before this Court if certiorari is granted, that Connecticut's trial courts possess the discretionary authority to deny "hearing" or "seeing" assistance to unrepresented physically handicapped defendants in civil actions notwithstanding the trial court's prior and unchanged determination that those defendants are incapable of reasonably hearing or seeing what is taking place in the courtroom at trial, due to such physical handicap, and need such assistance.

This case presents a substantial due process question directly affecting all pro se hearing and sight handicapped

defendants in all states' courts and federal courts, not merely Connecticut's.

This Court should settle any doubt that the decision by the State of Connecticut in this case is unconstitutional. That if a trial court makes a determination, as it did in this case, that a pro se defendant requires a "hearing" assistant in order to "hear" the trial proceedings; and if it never alters that finding thereafter; then it is not within that court's discretionary authority to deny such assistance if it is requested by the handicapped pro se defendant.

This Court should settle the fundamental question as to whether it is the constitutional right of every pro se defendant in a civil action brought against him, to be permitted a "hearing" assistant if he requests one, after it has been determined

by the trial court that he needs one in order to "hear" or be advised what is being said in the courtroom at trial.

Petitioner did not claim at trial, or in his appeal, that he is entitled to have a "hearing" assistant provided to him. Neither does he make that claim to this Court. He may furnish his own assistant who acts under the supervision of the trial court, and who may be discharged and replaced at the trial court's discretion.

In criminal trials in all states' courts and federal courts, including Connecticut state courts, prosecutors are permitted non-lawyer assistants to sit at or near their counsel table and communicate with the prosecutors during the trial proceedings. Trial courts rarely, if ever, supervise the substance of those communi-

cations. Rarely, if ever, are those non-lawyer assistants removed by the courts. No court has ever held that communication between a prosecutor and his non-lawyer assistant is illegal because the assistant might be furnishing "legal advice" to the prosecutor. Physically handicapped pro se defendants in civil actions who are determined by the trial court to be hard-of-hearing and in need of a "hearing" assistant in order to know what is being said in the courtroom during trial are constitutionally entitled to the equal protection of the laws that permit non-lawyer assistants to communicate with state prosecutors during criminal trials in Connecticut state courts.

It is vital that the herein question be settled by this Court in the interest of physically handicapped citizens who may be

sued and be incapable of obtaining legal counsel, and will be unable to know what is taking place in the courtroom during trial because of their physical handicap.

Without this Court's review and reversal of the State of Connecticut's decision in this case, those handicapped citizens will be deprived, under this now existing case law, of their fundamental right to due process of law.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the reasons stated herein, the Petition For A Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

James H Nadeau

Petitioner
JAMES H. NADEAU

No. _____

In The

Supreme Court Of The United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1993

JAMES H. NADEAU,
Petitioner,

v.

C. MICHAEL BUDLONG and
THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF CONNECTICUT

APPENDIX

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1) Opinion of Appellate Court of the State of Connecticut- C. Michael Budlong v. James H. Nadeau, 30 Conn. App. 61 (1993)	1A
2) Order on Petition for Certification to Appeal, 225 Conn. 909 (1993)	8A
3) Article IV, Section 2, of the United States Constitution	9A
4) Ninth Amendment to the United States Constitution	10A
5) Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution	11A

C. MICHAEL BUDLONG *v.* JAMES H. NADEAU (10612)

LAVERY, FREEDMAN and SCHALLER, Js.

The pro se defendant appealed to this court from the trial court's judgment in favor of the plaintiff attorney following a jury trial on both the plaintiff's action for libel and the defendant's counterclaim for legal malpractice. *Held:*

1. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting certain evidence that was not referred to in the complaint; the defendant failed to object to that evidence at trial.
2. The defendant's unpreserved claim that the trial court improperly instructed the jury was unavailing; the instructions given were correct.
3. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in refusing to permit the defendant to be coached by a nonlawyer at counsel table under the guise of providing hearing assistance.

Argued November 4, 1992—decision released January 19, 1993

Action to recover damages for alleged libel and slander, and for other relief, brought to the Superior Court in the judicial district of Hartford-New Britain at Hartford, where the defendant filed a counterclaim for legal malpractice; thereafter, the matter was tried to the jury before *Koletsky, J.*, judgment for the plaintiff on the complaint and on the counterclaim, from which the defendant appealed to this court. *Affirmed.*

James H. Nadeau, pro se, the appellant (defendant).

Kathleen A. Murrett, with whom was *Steven R. Dembo,* for the appellee (plaintiff).

LAVERY, J. The pro se defendant appeals from the trial court's judgment for the plaintiff following a jury trial on both the plaintiff's action for libel and the defendant's counterclaim for legal malpractice. The defendant claims that the trial court (1) improperly allowed the jury to consider evidence that was not referred to in the complaint, (2) improperly instructed

the jury regarding a number of issues, and (3) generally deprived him of a fair trial. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

The jury could reasonably have found the following facts. In February, 1988, the defendant contacted the plaintiff to retain legal services in an action for dissolution of marriage. At the time the plaintiff began representing the defendant, a contempt motion against the defendant was pending due to an alimony arrearage owed by the defendant. The attorney-client relationship between the plaintiff and defendant began to deteriorate by the spring of 1988, when the defendant refused to follow the advice of the plaintiff regarding the contempt motion. The plaintiff notified the defendant that he would be withdrawing his appearance with regard to the contempt motion, and the defendant then filed a pro se appearance.

At a hearing on June 28, 1988, the defendant appeared pro se and agreed before the court to an arrangement whereby the attorney for the defendant's wife would be a court-appointed trustee over certain of the defendant's bank accounts to ensure the defendant's payment of alimony to his wife. After that hearing, the defendant contacted the plaintiff and asked him to remain as his attorney in the divorce action. The plaintiff agreed to this, but the defendant soon decided that he was dissatisfied with the representation provided by the plaintiff. On or about October 31, 1988, he began picketing outside the judicial district courthouse at 95 Washington Street, Hartford, wearing a sandwich board that said in large letters: "Christopher Storm [the defendant's wife's attorney] is a liar and a thief C. Michael Budlong is helping him." The plaintiff continued to picket the courthouse until jury selection began for this case in the trial court. The defendant's car, which he would often park in front of the courthouse during this period, had signs taped to

it that said, "Christopher Storm is a liar and a thief C. Michael Budlong is helping him" and "Honest Lawyer wanted to sue Igor Sikorsky and C. Michael Budlong for unethical law practice Call Jim Nadeau 951-8966."[1] The defendant also posted signs the size of business cards in the courthouse bearing the "Honest Lawyer" message, and an eight and one-half by eleven inch sign bearing similar allegations against the plaintiff.[2]

Subsequent to the defendant's commencing his picketing, the plaintiff filed and was granted a motion to withdraw his appearance for the defendant in the action for dissolution of marriage. The plaintiff then started an action against the defendant in libel, and the defendant filed a counterclaim for malpractice.

During the trial, the defendant failed to object at any time to the admission of evidence regarding the signs on his car, or to the admission of the business card signs.[3] In fact, the defendant himself admitted into evidence, over the objection of the plaintiff, a sign that contained a number of allegations regarding Budlong and Sikorsky, and the message that was printed on the business card signs.

"Our rules of practice make it clear that counsel must object to a ruling of evidence, state the grounds upon which objection is made, and take exception to the ruling to preserve the grounds for appeal." *State* v. *Lizotte*, 200 Conn. 734, 742A, 517 A.2d 610 (1986);

[1] On appeal, the defendant claims that the trial court improperly allowed the jury to consider evidence concerning the picketing after October 31, 1988, and the signs on the defendant's car because those issues and supporting evidence were not mentioned in the plaintiff's complaint. The defendant's claim is considered in this opinion.

[2] The defendant himself offered the larger sign into evidence, and it was admitted.

[3] A review of the trial transcript for August 13, 1991, reveals that the court directly asked the defendant if he had any objection to the admission of evidence regarding the signs on the car and the business card sized signs. Each time the defendant said, "No."

Practice Book § 288. "Because the defendant failed to except to the trial court's ruling and because the defendant does not seek review under the bypass rule of *State* v. *Evans*, 165 Conn. 61, 70, 327 A.2d 576 (1973), as reformulated in *State* v. *Golding*, 213 Conn. 233, 239–40, 567 A.2d 823 (1989); see *Adolphson* v. *Zoning Board of Appeals*, 205 Conn. 703, 716, 535 A.2d 799 (1988); *Hurtado* v. *Hurtado*, 14 Conn. App. 296, 300, 541 A.2d 873 (1988) (applying *Evans* rule to civil cases); we decline to review this claim."[4] *Capitol Restorations Corporation* v. *Construction Services of Bristol, Inc.*, 25 Conn. App. 681, 686–87, 596 A.2d 927 (1991).

As the defendant correctly points out, the business card signs and the car signs were not mentioned in the plaintiff's complaint. The complaint merely alleged that the defendant picketed the courthouse with a sign that said "Christopher Storm is a liar and a thief C. Michael Budlong is helping him" on October 31, 1988, and particular dates in November of that year. Since the defendant failed, however, to object to offers of evidence beyond the scope of the complaint, he cannot now allege that the trial court improperly allowed the proffered evidence to go before the jury. "The trial court has broad discretion to determine both the relevancy and remoteness of evidence, and its rulings on evidentiary matters will be set aside on appeal only

[4] We note that in the last sentence of the defendant's brief *State* v. *Evans*, 165 Conn. 61, 70, 327 A.2d 576 (1973), is apparently mentioned. That sentence says, "Defendant was deprived of his Constitutional Right to a fair trial, and all errors, under *Evans*, are plain and harmful." The defendant is probably referring to the *State* v. *Evans* we cited above, regarding reviewability of unpreserved claims, but we are no means certain of this because of the citation form used. This reference to *Evans* is also located in a section of the defendant's brief that discusses only his claim that he was deprived of a fair trial. We review that claim later in this opinion. Finally, a claim that is stated but not briefed is deemed abandoned. *State* v. *Tanzella*, 28 Conn. App. 581, 602, 613 A.2d 825 (1992). The plaintiff did not properly brief an *Evans* claim in any part of the brief; therefore, we are not compelled to determine reviewability under *Evans*.

BEST AV

upon a showing of clear abuse of discretion." *Henry* v. *Klein*, 15 Conn. App. 496, 500, 545 A.2d 575 (1988). We find no such abuse of discretion by the trial court in this case.

The defendant next claims that the trial court improperly instructed the jury in several respects. Again, the defendant failed to preserve this issue properly for appeal. The defendant made no written request to charge, and took only a general exception to the jury instructions.[5] "In order to preserve full appellate review of a jury charge assigned as error, an appellant must not only move to set aside the verdict; *Small* v. *South Norwalk Savings Bank*, 205 Conn. 751, 758, 535 A.2d 1292 (1988); but must also set forth, either in the motion itself, in supporting briefs, or in oral argument at a hearing held on the motion, each claim of error with sufficient specificity to enable the trial court to consider the claimed errors." *Cuartas* v. *Greenwich*, 14 Conn. App. 370, 374, 540 A.2d 1071, cert. denied, 209 Conn. 803, 548 A.2d 436 (1988). Since the defendant did not preserve his claim that the trial court improperly charged the jury, we are limited in our review to whether the trial court committed "plain error."[6] Practice Book § 4185.

[5] At trial, after the court gave the defendant a detailed explanation of the jury instruction process, and the respective rights of the parties' during that process, the following exchange occurred:

"The Court: (to the defendant) . . . Do you have any exceptions to the charge that I gave? . . . I mean, you've got to tell me, to preserve this for appeal, you've got to say, this is what you did wrong, this is what you should have done. And I ask you to do it now.

"Mr. Nadeau: And then I say—I say I have an exception?

"The Court: Sure. I'll give you an exception. . . . Anything else you wish to say, sir?

"Mr. Nadeau: I'll leave it up to you, Your Honor."

[6] In *Schaffer* v. *Schaffer*, 187 Conn. 224, 227-28 n.3, 445 A.2d 589 (1982), our Supreme Court said: "Although as a general matter the rules of evidence and of the court are to be liberally applied to pro se litigants, we cannot go so far as to ignore entirely the requirement that a party's claims

AILABLE COPY

Plain error "is reserved for truly extraordinary situations where the existence of the error is so obvious that it affects the fairness and integrity of and public confidence in the judicial proceedings." (Internal internal quotation marks omitted.) *Cuartas* v. *Greenwich*, supra, 375. The trial court's charge to the jury was detailed, comprehensible to a reasonable juror, and correct in law. The charge was not only free of plain error, it contained no error.

The defendant's final claim is that the trial court did not conduct a "fair" trial. Specifically, the defendant claims that the court erred when it removed from the counsel table a person the defendant described as a hearing assistant. At the opening of the trial, the defendant requested that, because he has some difficulty hearing, he be allowed to have a friend repeat things said during the course of the trial, or write things down for him. The court, upon determining that the defendant had a hearing problem, allowed the assistant to sit with the defendant at the counsel table, provided that she follow strict guidelines. She was only permitted to repeat things to the defendant that were said in court, or write things down. On several occasions, the court admonished the defendant's friend for coaching the defendant when the court overheard comments that were not mere repetitions of what was said. Eventually, the court ordered the assistant to leave the counsel table when she refused to heed its warnings. The court did not allow another assistant, noting that the defendant had abused the privilege of being allowed one.[7]

must first be presented to the trial court before they may be reviewed on appeal." This principle applies to the defendant's claims regarding evidence and the jury instructions in this case.

[7] We note that our review of the transcript reveals that the defendant did not seem any less aware of what was being said and what was transpiring in the courtroom after the removal of his assistant. We also note that on numerous occasions during the course of the trial the court asked

The actions taken by the court were clearly within its discretion. "The trial court is vested with a large discretion over matters occurring in the conduct of the trial. While this is a judicial discretion and therefore subject to some degree of review and control, its exercise will not be interfered with unless it has been clearly abused to the manifest injury of a litigant." (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Connecticut Light & Power Co.* v. *Kluczinsky*, 171 Conn. 516, 521, 370 A.2d 1306 (1976). "The control of the order of the courtroom is necessarily within the discretion of the trial court, and unless abused cannot be reviewed." *Antel* v. *Poli*, 100 Conn. 64, 69, 123 A. 272 (1923). Here, the trial court acted in such a way as to prevent the unlicensed practice of law from occurring in its courtroom under the guise of hearing assistance. This action was properly within the trial court's discretion.

The defendant has also raised general claims as to the fairness of his treatment by the trial court. "This court has always been solicitous of the rights of pro se litigants and, like the trial court, will endeavor to see that such a litigant shall have the opportunity to have his case fully and fairly heard so far as such latitude is consistent with the just rights of any adverse party." *Conservation Commission* v. *Price*, 193 Conn. 414, 421 n.4, 479 A.2d 187 (1984). The trial judge in this case complied fully with the policy of our courts concerning pro se litigants. Our review of the trial transcript revealed that the court was solicitous, fair, and extremely patient throughout the course of the trial.

The judgment is affirmed.

In this opinion the other judges concurred.

---

the defendant if he heard and understood what was being said, and asked opposing counsel and witnesses to speak loudly and clearly so that the defendant could hear them.

C. MICHAEL BUDLONG *v.* JAMES H. NADEAU

The defendant's petition for certification for appeal from the Appellate Court, 30 Conn. App. 61 [AC 10612], is denied.

James H. Nadeau, pro se, in support of the petition.

Kathleen A. Murrett, in opposition.

Decided February 24, 1993

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

ARTICLE IV, SECTION 2

The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

(Balance of Section 2 is omitted.)

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

NINTH AMENDMENT

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT, SECTION 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 9 1993
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 92-1797

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1992

JAMES H. NADEAU,

Petitioner,

v.

C. MICHAEL BUDLONG AND
STATE OF CONNECTICUT,

Respondents.

**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari
To The Supreme Court Of the State Of Connecticut**

BRIEF OF THE RESPONDENT, C. MICHAEL BUDLONG, IN OPPOSITION

ANDREW E. BECKER, ESQ.
BUDLONG, BECKER & MURRETT
89 Oak Street
Hartford, CT 06106
Tel. (203) 727-9900
Juris No. 405677

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 1

ARGUMENT 2

CONCLUSION 6

APPENDIX ..... ia

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Anderson v. Dunn, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 204, 5 L.Ed. 242 (1821) 6

Antel v. Poli, 100 Conn. 64, 123 A.2d 272 (1923) 6

Connecticut Light & Power v. Kluczinsky, 171 Conn. 516, 370 A.2d 1306 (1976) 6

Gallagher v. Pontiac School District, 807 F.2d 75 (6th Cir., 1986) 4

Griffin v. Illinois, 351 U.S. 12, 76 S. Ct. 585, 100 L.Ed. 891 (1956) 4

Hudson v. Palmer, 468 U.S. 517, 104 S. Ct. 3194, 82 L.Ed.2d 393 (1984) 4

Joyce v. Mavromatis, 783 F.2d 56 (6th Cir. 1986) 4

Pisel v. Stamford Hospital, 180 Conn. 314, 430 A.2d 1 (1980) 5

United States v. Russell, 411 U.S. 423, 93 S. Ct. 1637, 36 L.Ed.2d 366 (1973) 3

Young v. United States ex. rel. Vuitton et Fils S.A., 481 U.S. 787, 107 S. Ct. 2124, 95 L.Ed.2d 740 (1987) 6

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Constitution of the United States, Fourteenth Amendment, §1 ..... 9a

TREATISES

Black's Law Dictionary (5th Ed.) 5

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Respondent brought an action against Petitioner in the Connecticut Superior Court for libel. After a three day trial, the jury found for the Respondent and awarded him $10,000 as damages.

On the first day of trial, the Petitioner appeared with a nonlawyer assistant and requested that she be permitted to assist him. The court, after stating that the Petitioner did not hear well, allowed Petitioner the privilege of an assistant at counsel table contingent upon her adherence to strict guidelines: she was to take notes and, if necessary, repeat what was said. There was no motion before the court; there was no evidence presented nor testimony elicited in support of Petitioner's claim that he had difficulty hearing. The court was merely responding to a request made by Petitioner which it granted with specified restrictions.

During the first day of trial, the court admonished the assistant not to advise Petitioner to "put that in question form," (Appendix, 4a), with the further caveat that she would be removed from counsel table if the court perceived it occurring again. Despite this admonition, the assistant continued to advise Petitioner. On the afternoon of the second day of trial, the court ordered her to remove herself stating she was not a lawyer and she could not advise a litigant in this court. The court denied Petitioner's request for an alternate as the court found he had abused the privilege of being allowed one.

During the remaining afternoon and next morning when the trial was completed, both the trial judge and Respondent's counsel continued to inquire of Petitioner

as to whether he could hear. (Appendix, 8a.) At no time did the Petitioner indicate he could not hear the proceedings.

The Petitioner appealed to the Connecticut Appellate Court claiming, *inter alia*, that he was denied a fair trial because of the removal of his assistant.

The Appellate court properly found that the trial court, using its broad discretion in the conduct of proceedings before it, did not abuse this discretion and upheld the trial court decision. The Petitioner then petitioned the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut for certiorari which was denied on February 24, 1993.

ARGUMENT

1. Petitioner's Statement of the Case Contains Misstatements of Fact.

There was never a finding by the trial court that Petitioner was hard of hearing. The trial judge merely acknowledged that the Petitioner did not hear well. (Appendix, 1a – 2a) There was no finding that Petitioner required a hearing assistant. The trial judge inquired as to the purpose of the assistant and Petitioner confirmed that it was to assist in hearing and taking notes of the proceedings. (Appendix, 2a.)

The trial judge, in conformity with the courts long-standing practice of granting leeway to pro se litigants, allowed an assistant to sit with the Petitioner during the trial subject to her compliance with strict guidelines. Petitioner could talk to her in a whisper if he couldn't read

part of her notes or if he wanted to ask a question about what was said, but no one, other than the pro se litigant, who is not a lawyer or a witness could talk in the courtroom. (Appendix, 3a.)

The Petitioner claim in his brief that he was without his assistant for the second half of the trial. In fact, the assistant was not removed until the afternoon of the second day of the three-day trial, where evidence concluded after two hours of testimony on the third day. Subsequent to the removal of his assistant, the record does not reflect that the Petitioner complained to the court about not hearing the proceedings. On inquiry from the court and counsel as to his ability to hear the proceedings, the Petitioner consistently answered in the affirmative. (Appendix, 8a.)

2. The Connecticut Court, Acting Within Its Authority and Exercising Its Discretion Prohibited The Unauthorized Practice Of Law In Its Presence Without Offending Due Process Or Depriving Petitioner Of His Constitutionally Protected Rights.

The essence of due process is fundamental fairness. "Due process is the element that, when absent, produces a reaction given to that which is shocking to the universal sense of justice." *United States v. Russell*, 411 U.S. 423, 432, 93 S. Ct. 1637, 36 L.Ed.2d 366 (1973).

It is unlikely on this record that the Court could reach the constitutional issues. Other than a general reference to several sections of the United States Constitution,

the Petitioner makes no specific reference as to how the Connecticut courts have violated his rights.

Additionally, the Petitioner fails to clearly set forth any substantial federal question he claims was erroneously decided by the Connecticut Court, nor does he cite any applicable decisions of this Court with which any such federal question conflicts.

The Petitioner has failed to establish himself as a member of a protected class. Even if he had, in order to establish a deprivation of an interest protected by the due process clause, he must show that he was excluded from protections afforded that class. *Gallagher v. Pontiac School District*, 807 F.2d 75 (6th Cir., 1986) This the Petitioner has failed to do.

His due process claim must fail under *Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517, 104 S.Ct. 3194, 82 L.Ed.2d 393 (1984) because there is no allegation or showing that the state's judicial process does not provide fair procedures which would remedy the wrong alleged, if proved.

In order to make out an equal protection claim for denial of access to courts, the Petitioner must allege discrimination based on poverty, race or some other reasonable classification. See, e.g. *Griffin v. Illinois*, 351 U.S. 12, 76 S.Ct. 585, 100 L.Ed. 891 (1956) Petitioner's equal protection argument must fail because the Petitioner has not established that he belongs to the group he alleged the wrong to be directed against. *Joyce v. Mavromatis*, 783 F.2d 56 (6th Cir. 1986)

While at first blush the issue the Petitioner presents appears of national importance, on closer examination, it

is evident that the Petitioner clouds the real issue: Whether a state court should be able to exercise its discretion to prevent the unlicensed practice of law under the guise of hearing assistance.

Furthermore, the facts of this case are peculiarly its own, not likely to recur, and too narrow to warrant review by this Court on certiorari. Most courts would not give a pro se litigant the degree of latitude the Connecticut trial court did. The Petitioner was unrepresented because he tried to retain counsel by advertising (HONEST LAWYER WANTED TO SUE C. MICHAEL BUDLONG AND IS FOR UNETHICAL LAW PRACTICE) and was unsuccessful. Petition for Writ of Certiorari, 3A

The Petition fails to acknowledge that the conditions of the privilege granted him by the court during the trial contained an obligation with which he did not comply. The assistant was not to engage in the unauthorized practice of law. Implicit in the grant of this privilege was the understanding that violation of the conditions would be an abuse of this privilege and result in its revocation. The Appellate Court properly found that the trial court has wide discretion over matters which occur during the trial. This broad discretion will not be interfered with unless it has been clearly abused to the manifest injury of the litigant. *Pisel v. Stamford Hospital*, 180 Conn. 314, 322, 430 A.2d 1 (1980). Petition For Writ of Certiorari, 7A

The courts' authority can be and has been said to mean the "[r]ight to exercise powers; to implement and enforce laws; to exact obedience; to command; to judge . . . " Black's Law Dictionary (5th Ed.) The courts, by their very creation, are vested with the power to

impose silence, respect, and decorum, in their presence, and submission to their lawful mandates. *Anderson v. Dunn*, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 204, 227, 5 L.Ed. 242 (1821); *Young v. United States ex. rel. Vuitton et Fils S.A.*, 481 U.S. 787, 107 S. Ct. 2124, 95 L.Ed.2d 740 (1987).

Finally, a reversal of the Connecticut Supreme Court decision would simply lead to more appellate review by putting into question longstanding state court principles regarding the broad discretion of the court in the conduct of its trials. *Connecticut Light & Power v. Kluczinsky*, 171 Conn. 516, 521, 370 A.2d 1306 (1976); *Antel v. Poli*, 100 Conn. 64, 69, 123 A.2d 272 (1923)

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to review the decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut in this matter should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Respondent
C. Michael Budlong, Esq.

ANDREW E. BECKER, ESQ.
BUDLONG, BECKER & MURRETT
89 Oak Street
Hartford, CT 06106
Tel. (203) 727-9900
Juris No. 405677

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Budlong v. Nadeau, Docket No. CV 88-354918 S, 8-13-91 Transcript, pp. 3-6, 161-162 ..... 1a

Budlong v. Nadeau, Docket No. CV 88-354918 S, 8-15-91 Transcript, pp. 125, 137-138 ..... 6a

Budlong v. Nadeau, Docket No. CV 88-354918 S, 8-16-91 Transcript, pp. 60, 141 ..... 8a

Constitution of the United States, Fourteenth Amendment, §1 ..... 9a

APPENDIX

Budlong v. Nadeau, Docket No. CV 88-354918 S, 8-13-91
Transcript, pp. 3 – 6

[T 3] THE COURT: Defense?

MR. NADEAU: James Nadeau.

THE COURT: N-A-D-E-A-U?

MR. NADEAU: Right.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. NADEAU: And Jean Crowe.

THE COURT: Spelled?

MS. CROWE: C-R-O-W-E.

THE COURT: C-R-O-W?

MS. CROWE: E.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. NADEAU: And Your Honor, she – I don't know how long this trial will last, and she's working. And I have another lady that has helped me write notes down. So would it be possible for her to be here too, and another day I'll either have one or the other for another trial.

THE COURT: If I understand correctly, sir, you do not hear very well, is that correct?

MR. NADEAU: You're right, Your Honor. Correct.

[T 4] THE COURT: And the purpose of the person sitting with you at counsel table is to assist you in hearing and taking notes of the proceedings for you?

MR. NADEAU: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. You want to be heard? Any objection to that?

MS. MURRETT: I have no objection to that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. MURRETT: As long as this person that's with Mr. Nadeau is not going to be questioning any witnesses or making any comments orally.

THE COURT: Did you hear that?

MR. NADEAU: No, I didn't hear that.

THE COURT: All right. There's no objection.

MR. NADEAU: Yes.

THE COURT: Attorney Murrett expressed some concern, she said no objection as long as the person with you, in this case Ms. Crowe, is not going to be questioning the witnesses or making any comments. And obviously I assume that you don't intend to have Ms. Crowe do that.

[T 5] MR. NADEAU: Suppose I have trouble relating something? Because my understanding of reading is not perfect. Could I have her read it for me?

THE COURT: No.

MR. NADEAU: If I –

THE COURT: You may have a –

MR. NADEAU: If I had subpoenaed her as a witness –

THE COURT: Excuse me, sir.

MR. NADEAU: Okay.

THE COURT: Only one of us can talk at a time. I'm not going to be able to hear you while I'm talking to you, and you're not going to be able to hear me, even with your bad hearing, if you're talking to me while I'm trying to talk to you.

MR. NADEAU: Right.

THE COURT: So I'll try to listen to you, but I can't listen and talk at the same time. Now we have a fancy word that we call colloquy. You can talk to her in a whisper, so the jury can't hear, if you can't read part of her notes or if you want to ask her a question about what was said. You and she or her substitute, if she's not here, may communicate with each other, but noone who is not a lawyer, or in your case pro se, being your [T 6] own lawyer – which you have a constitutional right to do – can talk in a courtroom unless they're a witness. Now you started to say something about subpoenaing her as a witness. Would you say a little more about that?

MR. NADEAU: I have, Your Honor. Because she has read some of my transcript, and she has done things where – I mean, she has called the court for information and she was insulted by the court clerk

because she was threatened to be arrested because she typed papers for me, by the court clerk.

THE COURT: What's that got to do with this case?

MR. NADEAU: Well, it could be important.

THE COURT: How?

MR. NADEAU: Well, it's just that as a pro se, I haven't been able to get the right information to properly defend myself. All I want to do is prove the facts.

Budlong v. Nadeau, Docket No. CV 88-354918 S, 8-13-91 Transcript, pp. 161-162

[T 161] THE COURT: Go ahead. No, ma'am. Excuse me. Ms. Crowe, I just overheard you talk to Mr. Nadeau, and say, put that in question form.

MS. CROWE: Yes, sir, because I thought that's what you said to him.

THE COURT: That's advice. You're there to help him hear, not to be a lawyer. I will not permit that again. I will remove you from counsel table if I perceive it occurring again. Do you understand?

MS. CROWE: I understand, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Very well. Go ahead, Mr. Nadeau.

MR. NADEAU: I believe, Your Honor, you've warned me long enough – oftentime that she – rather than you do it, she thought it would be best.

[T 162] THE COURT: She has a very limited job. I'm sure she meant well, but we're going to follow the rules. Please put your question.

Budlong v. Nadeau, Docket No. CV 88-354918 S, 8-15-91
Transcript, p. 125

[T 125] THE COURT: . . . Ma'am? Ms. Crowe?

MS. CROWE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: It's inappropriate for you to say, keep going, keep going.

MS. CROWE: I was worried about the three and a half minutes that you mentioned. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Ma'am, you're there to help him hear, not to help him cross-examine.

Budlong v. Nadeau, Docket No. CV 88-354918 S, 8-15-91
Transcript, pp. 137-138

[T 137] THE COURT: Ms. Crowe, you will now remove yourself from counsel table and take a seat in the spectators' section. You have abused, beyond all imagination, the great leeway that I have accorded you and Mr. Nadeau.

MR. NADEAU: Your Honor, all she did – reminded me was say question, question.

MS. CROWE: I said, he said question, he said question.

MR. NADEAU: And instead of you saying it, sir – Your Honor, she –

THE COURT: I heard what she said.

MR. NADEAU: Please, I –

THE COURT: I've ruled. Take your seat in the spectator section, Ms. Crowe. Proceed, Mr. Nadeau.

MS. CROWE: Can someone take my place, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Take a seat in the spectator section Mr. (sic) Crowe. You are not an attorney. I will not have you advising a litigant in this Court. Take your seat in the spectator section. Mr. Nadeau, put a question.

[T 138] MR. NADEAU: I have asked for an alternate to write things for me.

THE COURT: Denied. Put a question.

Budlong v. Nadeau, Docket No. CV 88-354918 S, 8-16-91 Transcript, pp. 60, 141

[T 60] *Cross examination of James Nadeau by Ms. Murrett*

Q: Mr. Nadeau, can you hear me all right?

A: Yeah.

[T 141] N: I don't even know what she is asking for your honor. I don't know what she –

Ct: Sir, what is it you're saying, do you want to have someone up there to help you hear?

N: I don't know those terms that she is talking about.

Ct: I can't make her change her vocabulary, can you hear what she is saying?

N: But I don't know what the terms are.

Ct: Did you hear what she said?

N: Yes

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

AMENDMENT XIV.

§ 1. Citizenship rights not to be abridged by states

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

(3)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 24 1993
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 92-1797

In The

Supreme Court Of The United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1993

JAMES H. NADEAU,

Petitioner,

v.

C. MICHAEL BUDLONG and
THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF CONNECTICUT

REPLY TO BRIEF OF RESPONDENT, C. MICHAEL BUDLONG

JAMES H. NADEAU
Petitioner
271 Zion Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106
(203) 951-8966

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Printed by
Brescia's Printing Services, Inc.
66 Connecticut Boulevard
East Hartford, CT 06108
528-4284

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

I. Respondent's brief mis-informs this Court of the Facts 1

II. Respondent's legal argument is specifically contradicted by Connecticut's Constitution 5

III. Conclusion 6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

ARTICLE XXI, of the Amendments to the Constitution of Connecticut 5

I. RESPONDENT'S BRIEF MIS-INFORMS THIS COURT OF THE FACTS

A. The Opening sentence of Respondent's Argument (p.2) is a blatantly false statement of the Facts. It is obviously intended to mis-inform this Court so that it will deny a Writ of Certiorari to the handicapped Petitioner. Respondent falsely states:

> "(t)here was never a finding by the trial court that Petitioner was hard of hearing." (p. 2)

The record is replete with the opposite fact, as follows:

First, the Connecticut Appellate Court's memorandum of decision states that the trial court, *"upon determining that the defendant had a hearing problem,* allowed the assistant to sit with the defendant at the counsel table, provided that she follow strict guidelines." (Emphasis added) (see Petitioner's original Appendix, p. 6A).

Second, commencing on the first day of trial, the trial judge made the following statements:

1. ". . . I'm satisfied that Mr. Nadeau has difficulty hearing." (8-13-91, p. 53);

2. "The person next to Mr. Nadeau is there to assist him because he does not hear at a normal – doesn't hear normally, I guess is the word I'm looking for." (8-13-91, p. 99);

3. "I know you have trouble hearing, and I apologize for speaking so loudly, but I'm satisfied it's

the only way I can get across to you." (8-13-91, p. 156-7);

4. "And your problem is partially, to be sure, defective hearing . . ." (8-15-91, p. 50);

5. "I know you have a hearing problem. So I first want to understand if you heard all the words that I just said." (8-28-91, p. 5);

6. "And with a hearing problem on top of it, it's been something of a difficulty for me." (8-28-91. p. 6).

B. Respondent's "Statement of the Case" falsely states:

"At no time did the Petitioner indicate he could not hear the proceedings." (p. 2)

The record is replete with the opposite fact, as follows:

First, the Connecticut Appellate Court's memorandum of decision states that: "(a)t the opening of the trial, the defendant requested that, because he has some difficulty hearing, he be allowed to have a friend repeat things said during the course of the trial, or write things down for him." (see Petitioner's original Appendix, p. 6A).

Second, commencing on the first day of juror voir dire, Petitioner continuously advised the court of his hearing difficulty, as follows:

1. MR. NADEAU: And – well, I don't know, I didn't hear a word she says. I'm hard of hearing. (8-8-91, p. 14);

2. MR. NADEAU: I didn't hear you. (8-8-91, p. 33);

3. THE COURT: You're having trouble hearing?
MR. NADEAU: Somewhat, yes, Your Honor.
(8-8-91, p. 35);

4. THE COURT: Did you hear that?
MR. NADEAU: No, I didn't hear that.
(8-13-91, p. 4);

5. THE COURT: Did you not hear me or did you not understand?
MR. NADEAU: Certain words – sounds I can't hear. So I didn't know what you pronounced. I didn't hear the word.
THE COURT: All right. Because I'm speaking just as loud as I –
MR. NADEAU: It's not that. There are certain sounds I can't hear.
(8-13-91, p. 30);

6. MR. NADEAU: And could you tell her to stop, you know, mumbling, and that's all I hear. See, I didn't hear that last remark from her. And I believe at times she does it on purpose, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Nadeau, one, Attorney Murrett is not mumbling.
(8-13-91, p. 51);

7. MR. NADEAU: I want to remind her that many of the things she said already I haven't heard.
(8-13-91, p. 52);

8. MS. MURRETT: Mr. Nadeau, if you can't hear me, just please stop me.
   MR. NADEAU: I can't hear you.
   (8-15-91, p. 18);

9. MR. NADEAU: I didn't hear you.
   (8-15-91, p. 19);

10. THE COURT: Did you hear the question?
    MR. NADEAU: On the tape?
    THE COURT: Yes.
    MR. NADEAU: No, I didn't.
    (8-15-91, p. 36);

11. MR. NADEAU: I didn't hear that, Your Honor.
    (8-15-91, p. 71);

12. MR. NADEAU: I missed half of her sentence.
    (8-16-91, p. 32);

13. MR. NADEAU: What was said, Your Honor? I couldn't hear a word she said.
    (8-16-91, p. 76-7);

14. THE COURT: Now, exceptions to the charge from the defendant. And if you wish me to try to explain what it was that the other side just said, I'll try to do that as well.
    MR. NADEAU: Yes, Your Honor.
    (8-16-91, p. 142);

15. MR. NADEAU: I didn't hear what she said, the last statement.
    (8-28-91, p. 89);

16. MR. NADEAU: I need a best friend to stand here and let me hear and tell me what was said.
(8-28-91, p. 90)

* * * *

II. RESPONDENT'S LEGAL ARGUMENT IS SPECIFICALLY CONTRADICTED BY CONNECTICUT'S CONSTITUTION

A. Respondent incorrectly argues that the physically handicapped Petitioner is not entitled to equal protection, stating:

> "In order to make out an equal protection claim for denial of access to courts, the Petitioner must allege discrimination based on poverty, race or some other reasonable classification." (p. 4, Respondent's Argument)

Opposite to Respondent's legal argument, the Constitution of Connecticut specifically establishes that "equal protection of the law" shall not be denied to any person because of *"physical disability"*.

ARTICLE XXI, of the Amendments to the Constitution of Connecticut, states:

> *"No person shall be denied the equal protection of the law* nor be subjected to segregation or discrimination in the exercise or enjoyment of his or her civil or political rights *because of* religion, race, color, ancestry, national origin, sex or *physical* or mental *disability."* (emphasis added)

III. CONCLUSION

Based upon the reasons stated, the Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Petitioner
JAMES H. NADEAU